

-7-

REMARKS**Status of the Claims:**

The Office Action dated January 23, 2006, has been received and reviewed by the applicant. Claims 1-13, 32, 33, 35, and 38 are pending in the application. Claims 1-13, 32, 33, 35, and 38 stand rejected. No claims are allowed.

Claims Rejection - 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-3, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's acknowledged prior art (Background of Invention) in view of Arney et al. (US Patent 5,808,781).

Claims 5, 6, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's acknowledged prior art in view of Arney as applied to claims 1-4 and 7 above, and further in view of Furukawa et al. (US Patent 5,238,636).

Claims 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's acknowledged prior art in view of Arney as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hayashi et al. (US Patent 6,808,654).

Claims 12-13, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's acknowledged prior arts in view of Nishimura et al. (US Patent 5,141,461).

Claim 35 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's acknowledged prior arts in view of Nishimura as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Nishimura (US Patent 4,133,798), refers to as Nishimura2.

With respect to independent claims 1, 12, and 38, the Applicants have amended these claims to further distinction their invention over the cited art. Specifically, the Applicants have distinctly claimed a porous, flexible resin/film that has

-8-

a plurality of light scattering agents and pores throughout the entire film. Support for the amendments are found on page 13, lines 15-17 (polymeric) and

None of the cited art in Applicants' background section, nor Arney, nor Nishimura disclose a porous, flexible resin/film that has a plurality of light scattering agents and pores throughout the entire film. As stated in the previous response, Arney shows, in Fig. 14, an optical window 16 located centrally on the membrane 15. The pores 14 are absent in the region of the optical window 16 of Arney in order to have the device function properly. Pores are noticeably absent in all disclosures of Arney's optical window 16, by way of design. See, Arney's Fig. 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 14, and Fig. 17. Whereas, in Applicants' claimed invention pores are throughout the entire flexible film, including the light transmission region between the light guide plate and the transparent plate.

Additionally, the flexible, porous film claimed by the Applicant is able to contact either the light guide plate or the transparent plate to form an optical switch for an optical display device. There is no disclosure of any of the cited art performing this function or having light scattering agents dispersed throughout a flexible, porous film. Specifically, both Arney and Nishimura disclose non-flexible, non-polymeric membranes. In addition, Nishimura's structure isn't porous or an optical display device.

In view of the foregoing, this application is believe to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen H. Shaw
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 45,404

Stephen H. Shaw/sct
Telephone: (585) 477-7419
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646